Stable multiple vortices in collisionally inhomogeneous attractive Bose-Einstein condensates

J. B. Sudharsan,[1] R. Radha,[1,*] H. Fabrelli and A. Gammal,[2] and Boris A. Malomed[3]

[1]*Centre for Nonlinear Science (CeNSc), Post-Graduate and Research Department of Physics, Government College for Women (Autonomous), Kumbakonam 612001, India.*
[2]*Instituto de Física, Universidade de São Paulo, 05508-090, São Paulo, Brazil.*
[3]*Department of Physical Electronics, School of Electrical Engineering, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel.*

We study stability of solitary vortices in the two-dimensional trapped Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) with a spatially localized region of self-attraction. Solving the respective Bogoliubov-de Gennes equations and running direct simulations of the underlying Gross-Pitaevskii equation reveals that vortices with topological charge up to $S = 6$ (at least) are stable above a critical value of the chemical potential (i.e., below a critical number of atoms, which sharply increases with S). The largest nonlinearity-localization radius admitting the stabilization of the higher-order vortices is estimated analytically and accurately identified in a numerical form. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first example of a setting which gives rise to *stable* higher-order vortices, $S > 1$, in a trapped self-attractive BEC. The same setting may be realized in nonlinear optics too.

PACS numbers: 03.75.Lm; 05.45.Yv; 42.65.Tg

arXiv:1510.02223v1 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 8 Oct 2015

Introduction. The creation of atomic Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs) [1], and subsequent identification of nonlinear excitations in them, such as bright [2, 3] and dark solitons [4, 5] in quasi-one-dimensional "cigar-shaped" settings, has triggered a great deal of interest in the investigation of matter-wave dynamics in the BEC, which is very accurately modelled by the Gross-Pitaevskii equation (GPE) [6]-[9]. In its general form, it is tantamount to the three-dimensional (3D) nonlinear Schrödinger equation which includes a trapping potential and a cubic term accounting for the mean-field nonlinearity.

The discovery of robust coherent nonlinear excitations, in the form of *dromions* [10] (localized 2D patterns produced by overlapping of 1D ghost solitons) and *lumps* (weakly localized 2D solitons) [11] in other 2D models has prompted looking for similar nonlinear excitations in BEC as well, following the investigation of more straightforward nonlinear modes – in particular, vortices [12] and Faraday waves [14] – in effectively 2D "pancake-shaped" BECs. Faraday waves are undulating nonlinear excitations generated by time-periodic shaking of the trapping potential, while vortices are created by stirring the condensate with the help of properly designed laser beams, by coherent transfer of orbital angular momentum to the condensate by the two-photon stimulated Raman process [12, 13], or by imprinting an appropriate phase pattern onto a trapped condensate [15], see recent survey [16]. While in self-repulsive condensates, simple vortices (with topological charge 1) are normally stable, their stability in attractive BEC is a challenging problem, as the self-attraction gives rise to both collapse and azimuthal instability of solitary vortices, thus easily destroying them [17]-[26]. Vortex solitons tend to be unstable even in media where the collapse does not occur, such as those featuring the quadratic nonlinearity [27].

The identification and experimental demonstration of more complex vortical structures, such as vortex dipoles [28, 29] and quadrupoles [30, 31], was confined to BEC with the self-repulsive nonlinearity. The most natural setting for hosting vortices is provided by a pancake-shaped axially symmetric BEC, which is strongly confined in one direction (z) and weakly confined in the transverse plane. Although stable vortices with topological charge $S = 1$ have been predicted in the 2D self-attractive BEC with an in-plane trapping potential [20]-[22], all multiple vortices with $S \geq 2$ were found to be unstable in the same model. This occurs by virtue of the fact that multiple vortices are vulnerable to instability against splitting into unitary ones (in repulsive media too [13, 18, 19]).

Stabilization of multiple vortices is a fundamentally interesting problem [23]. The present work aims to predict stable vortices with $S \geq 2$ in a condensate with *spatially localized* attractive nonlinearity, which, without the help of the trapping potential, may support stable fundamental solitons (with $S = 0$), but not vortices [26, 32]. To the best of our knowledge, the setting elaborated in the present work is the first system which gives rise to stable higher-order vortices in the trapped self-attractive BEC. The model may also find its realization in nonlinear optics.

The model and basic results. In the mean-field approximation, the self-attractive BEC, weakly trapped in the radial direction and strongly confined along the z axis, is governed by the 3D GPE for the single-atom wave func-

*Electronic address: radha˙ramaswamy@gcwk.ac.in

tion [6, 7]:

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial T}=\left(-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla_{\rm 3D}^2+\frac{m}{2}\Omega_z^2[\Omega_r^2(X^2+Y^2)+Z^2]\right.$$
$$\left.+\frac{4\pi\hbar^2a_s\mathcal{N}}{m}|\Psi|^2\right)\Psi, \quad (1)$$

where $\nabla_{\rm 3D}^2$ acts on coordinates X, Y, Z, m is the atomic mass, Ω_r and Ω_z are frequencies of the radial and axial confinement (so that Ω_r is defined as the relative frequency), a_s is the s-wave scattering length, which is negative for the attractive interatomic interactions, and $\mathcal{N}$ is the number of atoms in the condensate, the norm of the wave function being 1. Factorizing the wave function by means of the usual substitution, $\Psi(X,Y,Z,t) = \pi^{-1/4}a_z^{-3/2}\exp\left(-i\Omega_z t/2 - Z^2/2a_z^2\right)\psi(x,y,t)$, where $a_z = \sqrt{\hbar/m\Omega_z}$ is the transverse-confinement size, one integrates Eq. (1) over Z to derive the 2D form of the GPE [33–35] in terms of the scaled coordinates, $(x,y) \equiv (X,Y)/a_z$, $t \equiv \Omega_z T$: $i\partial\psi/\partial t = \left[-(1/2)\nabla_{\rm 2D}^2 + (1/2)\,\Omega_r^2 r^2 + gN|\psi|^2\right]\psi$, where (r,θ) are the polar coordinates in the (x,y) plane, and $g \equiv 2a_s\sqrt{2\pi m\Omega_z/\hbar}$ is the effective strength of the nonlinearity. The 2D wave function is also subject to the unitary normalization condition, $\int\int|\psi(x,y,t)|^2dxdy = 1$. We here assume that the atomic density is not too high, therefore deviation of the nonlinearity in the 2D equation from the cubic term [34] may be neglected.

It was predicted in various forms theoretically [26] and demonstrated experimentally [36] that the use of a Feshbach resonance controlled by laser illumination [37] makes it possible to engineer spatially inhomogeneous nonlinearity [26]. Accordingly, the modified 2D GPE is rewritten as

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t}=\left(-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\rm 2D}^2+\frac{1}{2}r^2+g(r)N|\psi|^2\right)\psi, \quad (2)$$

with the nonlinearity coefficient, g, made a function of the radial coordinate, and $\Omega_r = 1$ fixed by straightforward rescaling.

Stationary vortex solutions to Eq. (2) are sought for as

$$\psi(r,\theta,t) = R(r)\exp(iS\theta - i\mu t), \quad (3)$$

where S is the integer vorticity and μ the chemical potential. Inserting Eq. (3) in Eq. (2), we obtain an equation for amplitude $R(r)$

$$2\mu R + R'' + r^{-1}R' - \left(S^2r^{-2}+r^2\right)R - 2gNR^3 = 0, \quad (4)$$

which can be solved numerically.

We choose a Gaussian spatial-modulation profile for the localized self-attraction:

$$g(r) = -\exp\left(-b^2r^2/2\right), \quad (5)$$

where b^{-1} determines the radius of the nonlinearity-bearing area, and a free coefficient in front of the Gaussian was absorbed into N in Eq. (2), hence N is proportional to the number of atoms, but is not identical to it, unlike $\mathcal{N}$ in Eq. (1). Thus, there remain two free parameters in Eq. (2), b and N. While N characterizes the strength of the nonlinearity, $1/b$ determines the the radius of the nonlinearity-bearing region, in units of the trapping size imposed by the in-plane harmonic-oscillator (HO) potential. The case of $b^2 \ll 1$ amounts to the settings studied in works [20, 21], which, as said above, admit stable trapped states solely with $S = 0$ and 1. On the other hand, $b^2 \gg 1$ implies that the system is almost linear, with a small nonlinear spot placed at the center. In that case, the vortices are, essentially, the same modes as their counterparts trapped in the HO potential in the framework of linear quantum mechanics, hence they are stable. Thus, a nontrivial issue is to find a minimum value, $b_{\rm min}$, at which the localization of the nonlinearity leads to the stabilization of the vortices with $S \geq 2$. The results reported below demonstrate that $b_{\rm min} \approx 1.0$ (in particular, for $S = 4$). This finding can be understood by noting that the radial wave function of the linear HO, $R_S(r) = (\pi S!)^{-1/2}\,r^S\exp\left(-r^2/2\right)$, yields average value $\left\langle r^2\right\rangle = 1+S$. Then, the stabilization condition in the framework of Eq. (2) may be naturally defined as the attenuation of the local strength of the nonlinearity by modulation profile (5) by an order of magnitude (or more) at the location of the vortex, $r^2 = \left\langle r^2\right\rangle$ (this mechanism is different from the centrifugal stabilization effect proposed in Ref. [17], which was relevant for the uniform nonlinearity). Thus, the stabilization is expected at $b \geq \sqrt{(2/(1+S))\ln 10}$. In particular, for $S = 4$ the estimate yields $b_{\rm min} \approx 0.96$, in reasonable agreement with the numerical findings.

In addition to BEC, the model based on Eqs. (2) and (5), with t replaced by the propagation distance, may be realized in optics as a spatial-domain propagation equation in a bulk waveguide, with the localized Kerr nonlinearity [26], and the linear confining potential representing transverse modulation of the refractive index in a guiding channel. The localized nonlinearity may be provided by inhomogeneously doping the host material with elements which induce local enhancement of the nonlinearity via the two-photon resonance [38].

When the number of atoms is very small ($N \to 0$), the model reduces, as said above, to the HO, with the respective eigenvalues, $\mu_{\rm max} = 1 + S$. The contribution of the self-focusing nonlinearity to μ is negative, therefore $\mu_{\rm max}$ is the upper limit for values of the chemical potential of trapped vortices.

The most essential results of the present work are summarized in Fig. 1 and Tables 1 and 2. In the figure, families of the vortices are represented (including their stability, see details below) by dint of $\mu(N)$ curves, for different values of S at $b = 1.5$. The results demonstrate that the vortices are stable at $\mu_{\rm min} < \mu < \mu_{\rm max}$, where $\mu_{\rm min}$ is the boundary between solid and dashed segments in Fig. 1. At $\mu < \mu_{\rm min}$ the vortices are unstable, suffering splitting and collapse (details are shown below). The figure also demonstrates that values of N corresponding to $\mu_{\rm min}$ increase with S, which means that stable vortices

with a higher topological charge may hold much more atoms than their counterparts with $S = 1$ and 2. General results for a range of relevant values of b are collected in Tables 1 and 2.



FIG. 1: (Color online) $\mu(N)$ curves for different vorticities S, as produced by the numerical solution of Eq. (4) with $b = 1.5$. Solid and dashed lines denote stable and unstable portions of the trapped-vortex families.

Table 1: Intervals $(\mu_{\min}; \mu_{\max})$ in which the vortices are stable, at different values of S and b. For $S = 1, 3, 4$, only $\mu_{\min}$ is given, as $\mu_{\max} = 1 + S$ in these cases.

	S=1	S=2	S=3	S=4	S=5	S=6
b=0.75	1.21	(2.16;2.27)	unst.	unst.	unst.	unst.
b=1.0	1.29	(2.30;3)	unst.	4.82	(5.51;5.84)	(6.51;6.60)
b=1.5	1.51	(2.58;3)	3.64	4.69	(5.73;6)	(6.76;7)
b=2.0	1.66	(2.73;3)	3.79	4.83	(5.85;6)	(6.84;6.96)

Table 2: Intervals $(N_{\min}; N_{\max})$ in which the vortices are stable, at different values of S and b. For $S = 1, 3, 4$, only $N_{\max}$ is given, as $N_{\min} = 0$ in these cases.

	S=1	S=2	S=3	S=4	S=5	S=6
b=0.75	11.0	(18;20.3)	unst.	unst.	unst	unst.
b=1.0	12.2	(0;25)	unst.	27.4	(42.5;103)	(150;172)
b=1.5	15.1	(0;41)	101	237	(0;550)	(0;1274)
b=2.0	20.7	(0;83)	299	1066	(0;3829)	(2160;13418)

Note that, for $S = 5$ and 6, Table 2 includes entries with the stability intervals starting at finite $N_{\min}$, rather than at $N = 0$. Accordingly, in Table 1, these cases correspond to $\mu_{\max} < 1 + S$. This complex behavior cannot be explained by simple arguments given above, and might only be revealed by the systematic numerical analysis.

These results can be translated into physical units, taking the atomic BEC of ^{7}Li as an example, with $\Omega_z/2\pi \sim 1$ kHz, which corresponds to $a_z \sim 3$ μm, and the in-plane trapping frequency ~ 10 Hz. Then, the actual number of atoms is estimated as $\sim 500N$ (N are the values shown in Fig. 1 and Table 2), and the size of the vortices, which are shown below in Figs. 3-4, is obtained from the respective scaled lengths by multiplying them by ~ 30 μm. Thus, the critical values of the atom number, corresponding to the data presented in Table 2, range from ~ 5000 for $S = 1$ to $\sim 5 \times 10^7$ for $S = 6$. The latter estimate implies that practically all the vortices with high values of S, which can be created at relevant values of b, will be stable.

The linear-stability analysis. The stability results reported above were produced by taking perturbed solutions to Eq. (2) as [21]

$$\psi(r,t) = \left[R(r) + \varepsilon \sum_L u_L(r) e^{iL\theta - i\omega_L t} + \varepsilon \sum_L v_L^*(r) e^{-iL\theta + i\omega_L^* t} \right] e^{iS\theta - i\mu t}, \quad (6)$$

where (u, v) and ω_L are eigenmodes and eigenfrequencies corresponding to integer azimuthal index L of the perturbation with infinitesimal amplitude ε. The linearization around the stationary solution leads to a system of the Bogoliubov de-Gennes equations [7],

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{D}_+ & gR^2 \\ -gR^2 & -\hat{D}_- \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_L \\ v_L \end{pmatrix} = \omega_L \begin{pmatrix} u_L \\ v_L \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$$\hat{D}_\pm \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r} - \frac{(S \pm L)^2}{r^2} \right] + \frac{1}{2}\Omega_r^2 r^2 + 2gNR^2 - \mu,$$

supplemented by the boundary conditions requiring $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ to decay as $r^{|S \pm L|}$ at $r \to 0$, and exponentially at $r \to \infty$.

The determination of the stability from Eq. (7) requires numerical diagonalization of the matrix. The vortex is unstable if, for given μ, at least one pair of eigenvalues ω_L is complex. Results of the analysis are illustrated by Fig. 2, which shows the instability growth rates of perturbations, i.e., the largest imaginary part of ω_L, vs. μ for $S = 1, 2, 3$ and 6. We conclude that stability regions exist for all these values of S, as shown above in Fig. 1 and Tables 1 and 2.

Perturbed evolution of the trapped vortices. To corroborate the predictions of the linear-stability analysis, we have performed simulations of perturbed evolution of the vortices in the framework of Eq. (2), using the split-step and D'yakonov methods [39, 40]. We have chiefly employed a grid with 400×400 points and spatial spacing $\Delta x = \Delta y = 0.025$, the time step being $\Delta t = 0.00005$. To ensure robustness of the algorithm, the results were compared to those produced with other values of $\Delta x = \Delta y$ and Δt. Initial random perturbations with a 5% relative amplitude were added in the simulations.

First, in Fig. 3, we display the perturbed evolution of a stable vortex with $S = 3$ and $\mu = 3.8$ ($N = 69$), in terms of the density and phase. It exhibits rapid self-cleaning of the initially perturbed configuration, which is observed in the stability regions for all values of S.

In the instability region, the simulations display fragmentation of vortices, depending on azimuthal index L of



FIG. 2: (Color online) The imaginary part of eigenfrequencies for different values of azimuthal index L of perturbation modes for vortices with $S = 1, 2, 3$ and 6.

the respective leading perturbation eigenmode, as shown in Fig. 4. In this figure, the unstable vortex with $S = 3$ breaks into four fragments, the corresponding dominant eigenmode indeed having $L = 4$. Eventually, the fragments suffer the intrinsic collapse.

Thus, the direct simulations corroborate the predictions of the linear-stability analysis for the trapped higher-order vorticities, including the fact that the splitting of unstable vortices is driven by dominant perturbation eigenmodes. It is worth to note that, unlike the model with the uniform attractive nonlinearity [21], here the stability and instability regions are not separated by a semi-stable one, where the vortex with $S = 1$ periodically splits and recombines, keeping the vorticity intact.



FIG. 3: (Color online) The evolution of the density and phase for the vortex with $S = 3$ and $\mu = 3.8$ ($N = 69$). Random perturbation, added at $t = 0$, is quickly eliminated by self-cleaning of the stable vortex, becoming invisible at $t = 0.8$, even if it is ~ 0.1 of the characteristic diffraction time for the entire vortex. Here and below, in density profiles, brighter regions correspond to higher density, and the phase varies from $-\pi$ to π from darker to brighter regions.

Conclusions. We have introduced the model of a 2D trapped BEC with the self-attractive nonlinearity acting in a spatially localized manner. Unlike the previously studied systems with the uniform self-attraction, in which trapped vortices may be stable solely with topological charge $S = 1$, the present setting gives rise to stability areas for multiple vortices, with $1 \leq S \leq 6$. The largest radius of the nonlinearity localization, which allows the stabilization of the higher-order vortices, was



FIG. 4: (Color online) Perturbed evolution of the density field for the unstable vortex with $S = 3$ and $\mu = 0$ ($N = 90$).

estimated analytically, and accurately found in the numerical form, using the linear-stability analysis and direct simulations. The number of atoms which can be held by the stable vortex sharply increases with S. Challenging problems for further analysis are the consideration of rotating multi-vortex complexes (cf. Ref. [31]) and generalization for the 3D setting.

Acknowledgments. J.B.S. wishes to thank Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), India, for the financial support. R.R. acknowledges DST (grant No. SR/S2/HEP-26/2012), Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), India (grant 03(1323)/14/EMR-II dated 03.11.2014) and Department of Atomic Energy - National Board of Higher Mathematics (DAE-NBHM), India (grant 2/48(21)/2014 /NBHM(R.P.)/R & D II/15451) for financial support in the form of Major Research Projects. H.F. and A.G. thank FAPESP, CNPq and CAPES (Brazil) for financial support.

[1] M. H. Anderson, J. R. Enshe, M. R. Matthews, C. E. Wieman and E. A. Cornell, Science **269**, 198 (1995); C. C. Bradley, C. A. Sackett, J. J. Tollett, and R. G. Hulet, *ibid.* **75**, 1687 (1995); K. B. Davis, M. O. Mewes, M. R. Andrews, N. J. Van Druten, D. S. Durfee, D. M. Kurn and W. Ketterle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 3969 (1995).

[2] K. E. Strecker, G. B. Partridge, A. G. Truscott, and R. G. Hulet, Nature **417**, 150 (2002); L. Khaykovich, F. Schreck, G. Ferrari, T. Bourdel, J. Cubizolles, L. D. Carr, Y. Castin, and C. Salomon, Science **296**, 1290 (2002); B. Eiermann, Th. Anker, M. Albiez, M. Taglieber, P. Treutlein, K.-P. Marzlin, and M. K. Oberthaler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 230401 (2004); S. L. Cornish, S. T. Thompson, and C. E. Wieman, *ibid.* **96**, 170401 (2006); A. L. Marchant, T. P. Billam, T. P. Wiles, M. M. H. Yu, S. A. Gardiner, S. L. Cornish, Nature Comm. **4**, 1865 (2013); P. Medley, M. A. Minar, N. C. Cizek, D. Berryrieser, and M. A. Kasevich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 060401 (2014).

[3] K. E. Strecker, G. B. Partridge, A. G. Truscott, and R. G. Hulet, New. J. Phys. **5**, 73 (2003); V. A. Brazhnyi and V. V. Konotop, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **18**, 627 (2004); F. Kh. Abdullaev, A. Gammal, A. M. Kamchatnov, and L. Tomio, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **19**, 3415 (2005).

[4] S. Burger, K. Bongs, S. Dettmer, W. Ertmer, K. Sengstock, A. Sanpera, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 5198 (1999); J. Denschlag, J. E. Simsarian, D. L. Feder, C. W. Clark, L. A. Collins, J. Cubizolles, L. Deng, E. W. Hagley, K. Helmerson, W. P. Reinhardt, S. L. Rolston, and B. I. Schneider, W. D. Phillips, Science **287**, 97 (2000); P. Engels and C. Atherton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 160405 (2007); A. Weller, J. P. Ronzheimer, C. Gross, J. Esteve, M. K. Oberthaler, D. J. Frantzeskakis, G. Theocharis and P. G. Kevrekidis, *ibid.* **101**, 130401 (2008); C. Becker, S. Stellmer, P. Soltan-Panahi, S. Dörscher, M. Baumert, E.-M. Richter, J. Kronjäger, K. Bongs, and K. Sengstock, Nature Phys. **4**, 496-501 (2008); G. Lamporesi, S. Donadello, S. Serafini, F. Dalfovo, and G. Ferrari, *ibid.* **9**, 656 (2013); C. Hamner, Y. Zhang, J. J. Chang, C. Zhang, and P. Engels, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 264101 (2013).

[5] D. J. Frantzeskakis, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **43**, 213001 (2010).

[6] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii, and S. Stringari, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 463 (1999); A. J. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 307 (2001); W. Z. Bao, D. Jaksch, and P. A. Markowich, J. Comp. Phys. **187**, 318 (2003); K. Bongs and K. Sengstock, Rep. Prog. Phys. **67**, 907 (2004); A. Minguzzi, S. Succi, F. Toschi, M. P. Tosi, and P. Vignolo, Phys. Rep. **395**, 223-355 (2004).

[7] C. J. Pethick and H. Smith, *Bose-Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002).

[8] R. Radha and V. Ramesh Kumar, Phys. Lett. A **370**, 46 (2007); R. Radha and V. Ramesh Kumar, P. K. Panigrahi, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 023611 (2008).

[9] M. Brtka, A. Gammal and L. Tomio, Phys. Lett. A **359**, 339-344 (2006); P. Muruganandam and S. K. Adhikari, Comp. Phys. Comm. **180**, 1888 (2009).

[10] M. Boiti, J. J.-P. Leon, L. Martina and F. Pempinelli, Phys. Lett. A **132**, 432 (1988); A. S. Fokas and P. M. Santini, Physica D **44**, 99 (1990); R. Radha and M. Lakshmanan, J. Mat. Physics **35**, 4746 (1994). R. Radha and M. Laskhmanan, Phys. Lett. A **197**, 7 (1995).

[11] J. Satsuma and M. J. Ablowitz, J. Math. Phys. **20**, 1496-1503 (1979).

[12] M. R. Matthews, B. P. Anderson, P. C. Haljan, D. S. Hall, C. E. Wieman and E. A. Cornell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2498 (1999); I. Josopait, L. Dobrek, L. Santos, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, Eur. Phys. J. D **22**, 385 (2003); K. Kasamatsu, M. Tsubota, and M. Ueda, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **19**, 1835 (2005); M. F. Andersen, C. Ryu, P. Clade, V. Natarajan, A. Vaziri, K. Helmerson, and W. D. Phillips, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 170406 (2006); K. C. Wright, L. S. Leslie, and N. P. Bigelow, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 041601 (2008); K. C. Wright, L. S. Leslie, A. Hansen, and N. Bigelow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 030405 (2009).

[13] A. L. Fetter, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 647 (2009).

[14] P. Engels, C. Atherton, and M. A. Hoefer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 0955301 (2007); A. Balaž and A. I. Nicolin, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 023613 (2012); A. Balaž, R. Paun, A.

I. Nicolin, J. B. Sudharsan and R. Radha, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 049902 (2014).
[15] A. E. Leanhardt, A. Gorlitz, A. P. Chikkatur, D. Kielpinski, Y. Shin, D. E. Pritchard and W. Ketterle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 190403 (2002).
[16] A. C. White, P. Anderson, and S. Bagnato, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **111**, 4719 (2014).
[17] F. Dalfovo and S. Stringari, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 2477 (1996).
[18] J. Neu, Physica D **43**, 385 (1990).
[19] H. Pu, C. K. Law, J. H. Eberly, and N. P. Bigelow, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 1533 (1999); Y. Castin and R. Dum, Eur. Phys. J. D **7**, 399 (1999); Y. Shin, M. Saba, M. Vengalattore, T. A. Pasquini, C. Sanner, A. E. Leanhardt, M. Prentiss, D. E. Pritchard, and W. Ketterle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 160406 (2004).
[20] R. J. Dodd, J. Res. Natl. Inst. Stand. Technol. **101**, 545 (1996); N. K. Wilkin, J. M. F. Gunn, and R. A. Smith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2265 (1998); T. J. Alexander and L. Bergé, Phys. Rev. E **65**, 026611 (2002); H. Saito and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 190402 (2002); H. Saito, and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 013604 (2004); G. M. Kavoulakis, A. D. Jackson, and G. Baym, *ibid.* **70**, 043603 (2004); E. Lundh, A. Collin, and K. A. Suominen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 070401 (2004); L. D. Carr and C. W. Clark, *ibid.* **97**, 010403 (2006). D. S. Wang, S. W. Song, B. Xiong, and W. M. Liu, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 053607 (2011).
[21] D. Mihalache, D. Mazilu, B. A. Malomed and F. Lederer, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 043615 (2006).
[22] M. Brtka, A. Gammal, and B. Malomed, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 053610 (2010).
[23] Y. Kawaguchi and T. Ohmi, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 043610 (2004); J. A. M. Huhtamäki, M. Möttönen, and S. M. M. Virtanen, *ibid.* **74**, 063619 (2006); P. Kuopanportti and M. Möttönen, J. Low Temp. Phys. **161**, 561 (2010).
[24] B. A. Malomed, F. Lederer, D. Mazilu, D. Mihalache, Phys. Lett. A **361**, 336 (2007).
[25] B. A. Malomed, D. Mihalache, F. Wise, and L. Torner, J. Optics B: Quant. Semicl. Opt. **7**, R53 (2005).
[26] Y. V. Kartashov, B. A. Malomed, and L. Torner, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 247 (2011).
[27] W. J. Firth and D. V. Skryabin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 2450 (1997); L. Torner and D. Petrov, Electron. Lett. **33**, 608 (1997).
[28] L.-C. Crasovan, V. Vekslerchik, V. M. Pérez-García, J. P. Torres, D. Mihalache and L. Torner, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 063609 (2003); Q. Zhou and H. Zhai, *ibid.* **70**, 043619 (2004); M. Möttönen, S. M. M. Virtanen, T. Isoshima and M. M. Salomaa, *ibid.* **71**, 033626 (2005).
[29] T. W. Neely, E. C. Samson, A. S. Bradley, M. J. Davis, and B. P. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 160401 (2010).
[30] L.-C. Crasovan, G. Molina-Terriza, J. P. Torres, L. Torner, V. M. Pérez-García and D. Mihalache, Phys. Rev. E **66**, 036612 (2002); V. M. Lashkin, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 043607 (2007); S. Middelkamp, P. G. Kevrekidis, D. J. Frantzeskakis, R. Carretero-González, and P. Schmelcher, *ibid.* **82**, 013646 (20110).
[31] R. Driben, N. Dror, B. Malomed, and T. Meier, New J. Phys. **17**, 083043 (2015).
[32] H. Sakaguchi and B. A. Malomed, Opt. Lett. **37**, 1035-1037 (2012); H. Saito and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett **90**, 040403 (2003).
[33] V. M. Pérez-García, H. Michinel, and H. Herrero, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 3837 (1998).
[34] L. Salasnich, Laser Phys. **12**, 198 (2002); L. Salasnich, A. Parola, and L. Reatto, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 043614 (2002); A. E. Muryshev, G. V. Shlyapnikov, W. Ertmer, K. Sengstock, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 110401 (2002).
[35] A. Muñoz Mateo and V. Delgado, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 013617 (2008).
[36] R. Yamazaki, S. Taie, S. Sugawa, and Y. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050405 (2010).
[37] P. O. Fedichev, Yu. Kagan, G. V. Shlyapnikov, and J. T. M. Walraven, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77** 2913 (1996); M. Theis, G. Thalhammer, K. Winkler, M. Hellwig, G. Ruff, R. Grimm, and J. H. Denschlag, Phys. Rev. Lett **93**, 123001 (2004); D. M. Bauer, M. Lettner, C. Vo, G. Rempe, and S. Dürr, Nature Phys. **5** 339 (2009); P. G. Mickelson, Y. N. Matrtinez de Escobar, M. Yan, B. I. DeSalvo, and T. C. Killian, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 051601(R) (2010); M. Yan, B. J. DeSalvo, B. Ramachandhran, H. Pu, and T. C. Killian Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** 123201 (2013).
[38] J. Hukriede, D. Runde, and D. Kip, J. Phys. D 36, R1 (2003).
[39] Ye. G. D'yakonov, Zh. Vych. Mat. **2**, 549 (1962) [USSR Comput. Math. Math. Phys. **2**, 581 (1963)].
[40] D. Quinney, *Introduction to the Numerical Solution of Differential Equations* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1987).